

Application Serial No. 10/669,913
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006

PATENT
Docket: CU-3369

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

OCT 31 2006

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 as being indefinite because of the phrase, "thus changing a range of a contrast ration....when a command changing a reference voltage value is transferred to the digital/analog converter...."

The claims were also rejected under nonstatutory double patenting doctrine. The Examiner determined the claims to be patentably indistinct from claim 2 of U.S. patent number 6,844,839. The terminal disclaimer that accompanies this response obviates the Examiner's rejection under the judicially created doctrine against double patenting.


Claim 1 has been amended to remove the word "thus" and to further clarify claim terminology to overcome the Examiner's rejection of the claims. Additional revisions to the claim were made to correct grammar.

The applicant submits that the revisions to the claims are not *Festo*-type subject matter surrenders but are instead claim language clarifications necessitated by the fact that the claims were translated from Korean. If the Examiner contends that the claim amendments are a subject matter surrender, the applicant asks the Examiner to set forth in detail, his reasons why the revisions to the claim terminology narrows the claimed subject matter.

Since the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4 are overcome, the applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 31, 2006


Joseph F. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300